UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,210	09/15/2004	Makoto Kawamura	257909US6PCT	5092

22850 7590 01/03/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
KAMAL, SHAHID	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3621	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/03/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/507,210	KAWAMURA, MAKOTO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shahid Kamal	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 September 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 September 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *09/15/2004, 10/17/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan (US Pub. No.: 2002/0019814 A1) in view of Ginter et al. (US Patent No.: 5,910,987).

Referring to claim 1, Ganesan discloses a license server providing a license for utilizing content (see at least figures 7, 14, paragraphs 0014-0015, 0231);

- a terminal requesting the license from the license server, obtaining the license, and utilizing the content based on the license (see at least abstract, paragraphs 0009-0010, 0016, 0044, 0090):

- duplicate-license determination means for determining whether or not the license requested by the terminal from the license server duplicates a license already held by the terminal (see at least paragraph 0072),

Ganesan does not expressly discloses license-duplication reporting means for reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested by the terminal from the license server duplicates a license already held by the terminal according to the determination result by the duplicate-license determination means.

Ginter et al. discloses license-duplication reporting means for reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested by the terminal from the license server duplicates a license already held by the terminal according to the determination result by the duplicate-license determination means (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 2, Ganesan discloses duplicate-license determination means for determining whether or not a license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license (see at least paragraph 0072).

Ganesan does not expressly discloses license-duplication reporting means for reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the determination result by the duplicate-license determination means.

Ginter et al. discloses license-duplication reporting means for reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the determination result by the duplicate-license determination means (see at

least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 3, Ganesan further discloses purchase-requesting means for requesting a purchase of the license from the license server according to an operation of a user, wherein the duplicate-license determination means determines whether or not the license to be purchased duplicates an already available license after or before the purchase-requesting means requests a purchase of the license from the license server (see at least abstract, paragraphs 0009-0010, 0016, 0044, 0072, 0090).

Referring to claim 4, Ganesan further discloses confirming means for confirming whether or not a license which duplicates an already available license is purchased when license duplication is reported by the license-duplication reporting means (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0124).

Referring to claim 5, Ganesan further discloses license-identification-information acquiring means for acquiring license identification information of a license required to utilize content from the license server (see at least abstract, paragraphs 0009-0010, 0016, 0044, 0090); and

- license-list storage means for storing a license list of licenses already purchased, wherein the duplicate-license determination means determines whether or not a license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license by comparing the license identification information acquired by the license-identification-information acquiring means with the license list stored by the license-list storage means (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Referring to claim 6, Ganesan discloses a duplicate-license determination step of determining whether or not a license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the determination result in the duplicate-license determination step.

Ginter et al discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the determination result in the duplicate-license determination step (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys,

encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 7, Ganesan discloses a duplicate-license determination step of determining whether or not a license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the determination result in the duplicate-license determination step.

Ginter et al. discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the determination result in the duplicate-license determination step (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 8, Ganesan discloses a duplicate-license determination step of determining whether or not a license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the determination result in the duplicate-license determination step.

Ginter et al. discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the determination result in the duplicate-license determination step (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 9, Ganesan discloses determination-result receiving means for receiving from the license server a result of determination as to whether or not a license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly discloses license-duplication reporting means for reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the result of determination as to license duplication received by the determination-result receiving means.

Ginter et al discloses license-duplication reporting means for reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the result of determination as to license duplication received by the determination-result receiving means (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 10, Ganesan further discloses confirming means for confirming whether or not a license which duplicates an already available license is purchased when license duplication is reported by the license-duplication reporting means (see at least abstract, paragraphs 0017, 0072, and 0124).

Referring to claim 11, Ganesan discloses content-identification-information sending means for sending to the license server content identification information for identifying the content to

be utilized, wherein the determination-result receiving means receives from the license server a result of determination as to whether or not the license required to utilize the content identified with the content identification information sent by the content-identification-information sending means duplicates an already available license (see at least abstract, paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Referring to claim 12, Ganesan discloses a determination-result receiving step of receiving from the license server a result of determination as to whether or not the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly discloses license-duplication reporting means for reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the result of determination as to license duplication received by the determination-result receiving means.

Ginter et al. discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the result of determination as to license duplication received in the determination-result receiving step (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 13, Ganesan discloses a determination-result receiving step of receiving from the license server a result of determination as to whether or not the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the result of determination as to license duplication received in the determination-result receiving step.

Ginter et al. discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the result of determination as to license duplication received in the determination-result receiving step (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys,

encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 14, Ganesan discloses a determination-result receiving step of receiving from the license server a result of determination as to whether or not the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the result of determination as to license duplication received in the determination-result receiving step.

Ginter et al. discloses a license-duplication reporting step of reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested from the license server duplicates an already available license according to the result of determination as to license duplication received in the determination-result receiving step (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 15, Ganesan discloses duplicate-license determination means for determining whether or not the license requested by the terminal duplicates a license already held by the terminal (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124); and

- determination-result sending means for sending a determination result by the duplicate-license determination means to the terminal (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly disclose query means for making an inquiry about licenses already held by the terminal.

Ginter et al. discloses query means for making an inquiry about licenses already held by the terminal (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 16, Ganesan discloses license-information storage means for storing information about the license provided to the terminal, wherein the query means asks the license-information storage means for licenses already held by the terminal (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Referring to claim 17, Ganesan discloses wherein the query means asks a management server managing information about the license provided to the terminal for licenses already held by the terminal (see at least abstract, and paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Referring to claim 18, Ganesan discloses when the duplicate-license determination means determines that the license requested by the terminal duplicates a license already held by the terminal and when a message confirming purchase of the license that duplicates the license already held by the terminal is sent from the terminal, the license requested by the terminal is provided to the terminal (see at least abstract and paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Referring to claim 19, Ganesan discloses a duplicate-license determination step of determining whether or not the license requested by the terminal duplicates a license already held by the terminal (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124); and

- a determination-result sending step of sending a determination result in the duplicate-license determination step to the terminal (see at least abstract and paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly disclose a query step of making an inquiry about licenses already held by the terminal.

Ginter et al. discloses a query step of making an inquiry about licenses already held by the terminal (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 20, Ganesan discloses a duplicate-license determination step of determining whether or not the license requested by the terminal duplicates a license already held by the terminal (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124); and

- a determination-result sending step of sending a determination result in the duplicate-license determination step to the terminal (see at least abstract and paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly disclose a query step of making an inquiry about licenses already held by the terminal.

Ginter et al discloses a query step of making an inquiry about licenses already held by the terminal (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

Referring to claim 21, Ganesan discloses a duplicate-license determination step of determining whether or not the license requested by the terminal duplicates a license already held by the terminal (see at least paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124); and

- a determination-result sending step of sending a determination result in the duplicate-license determination step to the terminal (see at least abstract and paragraphs 0017, 0072, 0124).

Ganesan does not expressly disclose a query step of making an inquiry about licenses already held by the terminal.

Ginter et al. discloses a query step of making an inquiry about licenses already held by the terminal (see at least abstract & column 34, lines 1-36, column 37, lines 3-34, column 55, lines 48-67, column 59, lines 17-34, column 87, lines 20-55, column 120, lines 37-67, column 159, lines 16-35, column 171, lines 13-44, column 266, lines 2-17, column 275, lines 43-67, column 277, lines 1-49, column 279, lines 6-21).

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified of Ganesan to include the step(s) taught by Ginter et al. as discussed above in order to provide a trusted environment for generating decryption key keys, encrypting and decrypting information, managing the secure communication of keys and other information between electronic appliances.

3. Examiner's Note: The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the patent examiner should be directed to Shahid Kamal whose telephone number is (571) 270-3272. The Patent examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:00am -7:00pm), Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on (571) 272-6919. The fax phone number for this origination where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published application may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Statues information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-directed.uspto.gov.

Should you have any questions on accessing to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 1(866) 217-9197 (toll free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 1(800) 786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 1(571) 272-1000.

JAMES P TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Shahid Kamal
December 15, 2007